

Remarks

Remarks relating to March 17, 2006 Advisory Action

This is a supplemental response to the final office action of December 30, 2005. Applicants previously responded to the office action on February 28, 2005. However, Applicants received an Advisory Action of March 17, 2006. In the Advisory Action the Examiner did not enter the amendments from the February 28 response, because the amendments to claim 1 raised new issues which would require further consideration. Specifically, the Examiner stated that “substantially hook shaped” end portions of a sheath in Applicant’s claims had only been indicated allowable, not a structural member in general with such end portions. However, the Examiner stated that claims 8-11 and 13-17 would be allowable if submitted in a separate timely filed amendment, for which indication Applicants express their appreciation.

In response to and in view of the Examiner’s comments, Applicants submit this supplemental response to the December 30 office action which is substantially the same as the February 28 response in most respects. However, claim 1 has been additionally amended to include the limitation that the flexible cable member is at least partially sheathed within the elongate structural member with “substantially hook shaped” end portions. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 and claims depending from claim 1 are now in proper form for allowance and the same is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-11 and 13-17 are submitted in identical form as in the February 28 response. Accordingly, in view of the Examiner’s comments in the Advisory Action, Applicants submit that the claims are in proper form for allowance.

Response to Dec. 30, 2006 office action

Claims 1-18 are in the case. Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 over the USPN 5,740,629 to Fischer et al. in view of USPN 6,382,869 to Dickinson. Claims 8, 13, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 over the ‘629 patent in view of USPN 391,526 to Foran. Claims 6, 10, 12, 16, and 18 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form, for which indication the applicants thank the

examiner. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 15 have been amended. Claims 12 and 18 have been cancelled. The specification and drawings have also been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments, which are supported by the disclosure of the original claims and the specification. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The specification is objected to because pages 7 and 8 were not in the case. Applicant has amended the last paragraph of page 6 of the specification to add portions of the specification previously on page 7 of the specification as it was originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS OBJECTIONS

The drawings are objected to because of various informalities. The drawings are hereby amended as shown in the replacement sheets to overcome the informalities. Drawings submitted with the prior amendment may have been too light and certain portions may have not appeared correctly. Accordingly, several drawings have been darkened to properly show all portions of the drawings. No new matter has been added by the amendments, which are supported by the drawings as originally filed with the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS & REJECTIONS UNDER §112

The claims are rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The claims are hereby amended as given above to overcome the 112 rejections. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '629 patent in view of the '869 patent. Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejection. However, in view of the finality of the rejection and applicants' desire to move

the application to issuance, applicants have amended the claims to include subject matter indicated as allowable by the examiner. Further claims of differing scope directed to applicants' invention will be sought in continuing applications. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that the elongate structural member has substantially hook shaped end portions with the flexible cable member at least partially sheathed therein, which the examiner has indicated as being allowable subject matter. Neither of the '629 or '869 patents describes elongate structural members with substantially hook shaped end portions with a flexible cable member at least partially sheathed therein.

Thus, claim 1 patentably defines over the '629 patent in view of the '869 patent. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1 and contain additional important aspects of the invention. Thus, claims 2-7 patentably define over the '629 patent in view of the '869 patent. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-7 are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 15 have been rejected over the '629 patent in view of the '526 patent. Applicants again respectfully traverse the examiner's rejection. However, in view of the finality of the rejection and applicants' desire to move the application to issuance, applicants have amended the claims to include subject matter indicated as allowable by the examiner. Further claims of differing scope directed to applicants' invention will be sought in continuing applications. Claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12 and claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 18. Claim 12 was indicated as including allowable subject matter, namely limitations relating to the orientation of the elongate horns. Neither of the '629 or '526 patents describes horns in the orientation disclosed in claim 12. Claim 18 was indicated as including allowable subject matter, namely the limitations relating to a member with substantially hook shaped end portions. Neither of the '629 or '526 patents describes members with substantially hook shaped end portions.

Thus, claims 8 and 15 patentably define over the '629 patent in view of the '526 patent. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 8 and 15 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 11-14 and 16-17 depend from independent claims 8 or 15 and contain additional important aspects of the invention. Thus, claims 11-14 and 16-17

patentably define over the '629 patent in view of the '526 patent. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-14 and 16-17 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that the claims of the present application patentably define over the prior art made of record and not relied upon for the same reasons as given above. Applicants respectfully submit that a full and complete response to the office action is provided herein, and that the application is now fully in condition for allowance. Action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed, applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension be charged to deposit account 12-2355. If other fees are required by this amendment, such as fees for additional claims, such fees may also be charged to deposit account 12-2355. Should the examiner require further clarification of the invention, it is requested that he contact the undersigned by phone.

Sincerely,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By:



Michael J. Bradford, 52,646